

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS

SEP 29 2006

The Office Action mailed July 11, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are submitted in response thereto. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

Despite the statement in the Office Action that applicant's previous arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection, it is noted that the prior art rejections against claims 1-15 have not in fact been substantively changed.

The rejection of claims 1-9, 12, and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass and further in view of Rakib is respectfully traversed. The invention is a replacement for the prior art system requiring an individual set-top box on every television monitor. The recited centralized gateway has a plurality of decoders decompressing respective data streams and a plurality of television adapters generating television signals usable by a respective television in response to a selected uncompressed data stream. In order to allow a user to select desired content at a particular television, port extenders are associated with each television to provide user selection data to the processor in the centralized gateway via a local-area network interface.

Hylton requires a set-top box at each television wherein each set-top box includes digital audio/video processing and decoding, NTSC encoding, and RF modulation. Each set-top box must be directly connected with the respective television to decode the video signal provided to that television (i.e., the set-top box in Hylton is in the video signal chain of the respective television). The port extenders recited in claims 1-15 do not carry any audio or video signal and only interact with the television through the centralized gateway (even when the same wires are used to communicate between the gateway and the port extender and between the gateway and the television). The final rejection argues that:

...the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the port extender do not carry any audio or video signal) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

It does not matter that the absence of an audio or video signal in the port extenders is not

-2-

(Serial No. 10/004,396)

recited because positive recitations already in the claims inherently cause this. Specifically, the claims recite television adapters adapted to be coupled to the televisions, wherein the television adapters generate television signals usable by the televisions. Since the television adapters are contained in the centralized gateway and are themselves coupled to the televisions, the recited television signals do not pass through the port extenders. The recited function of the port extenders is to allow a user to select a video feed. Thus, applicant's arguments are supported by specific claim recitations, and the claimed features are clearly distinguishable from the teachings of Hylton.

Regarding the addition of de Hass, the final rejection states:

de Hass is used to teach that it's known to use a plurality of decoders in a gateway device located within a site in order to deliver selectable signals to a plurality of connected port extender modules or TVs.

The foregoing statement reflects the mistake in the final rejection of equating a set top box or similar functionality as taught by Hylton or de Hass with a port extender as defined by the present claims. The claimed invention does not deliver selectable signals to the port extenders. Moreover, remotely providing separate video signals to separate display devices does not in any way suggest the claimed port extenders or the functions thereof. Since television signals in the claimed invention are transported independently of the user data which selects video feeds, the citations to Hylton and de Hass fail to teach the port extenders.

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1-9, 12, and 13 are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass in view of Rakib, and further in view of Humbleman is respectfully traversed. Humbleman fails to correct for the deficiencies noted above in the combination of Hylton, de Hass, and Rakib. Therefore, claim 10 is likewise allowable.

The rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass in view of Rakib, and further in view of Williams Jr. is

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 29 2006

respectfully traversed. Williams Jr. fails to correct for the deficiencies noted above in the combination of Hylton, de Hass, and Rakib. Therefore, claim 11 is likewise allowable.

The rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass and further in view of Rakib is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 recites the centralized gateway retrieving a first selected video feed from a digital network and generating a corresponding first television signal at a first television adapter. A first television supply cable is connected to the first television adapter. Therefore, the television signals are carried to the televisions independently of (i.e., without passing through) the port extenders. Thus, claims 14 and 15 are likewise allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-15 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: September 29, 2006
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)

-4-

(Serial No. 10/004,396)